



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,547	12/23/2003	Michal Louz-On	0026-0042	5793
44989	7590	05/14/2009	EXAMINER	
HARRITY & HARRITY, LLP			TANG, KAREN C	
11350 Random Hills Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 600			2451	
FAIRFAX, VA 22030				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/14/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/743,547	LOUZ-ON, MICHAL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KAREN C. TANG	2451	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 March 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-5 and 7-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 7-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

- Claims 1, 3-5, 7-29 are presented for further examination.
- Prosecution is now re-open due to the persuasive argument made on 3/2/09, pages 10

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-13, 15-22, 25-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-13, 15-23, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bary et al hereinafter Bary (US 2004/0158429) in view of Galai (US 2004/0177015) in further view of Hunt et al hereinafter Hunt (US 2004/0133848)

1. Referring to Claims 1, Bary discloses a method comprising: extracting by a processor of the computer system a set of uniform resource locators (URLs) from one document or from multiple documents associated with a single web host (refer to par 0072-0073); identifying sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs in the set of URLs as session identifiers, (refer to par 0187, par 0196) based on a particular rule (refer to par 0196); generating a clean set

of URLs from the set of URLs by removing the session identifiers; and determining when at least one particular URL has already been crawled based, on a comparison of the particular URL to the clean set of URLs (refer to par 0187);

Although Bary disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Bary did not explicitly disclosing "identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs;"

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing "identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs (refer to par 0090 and par 0091)"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Bary and Galai because Galai's teaching of "identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs;" improves Bary's system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (refer to Hunt, par 203 and par 0235) and also provides the users' of Bary a better website search engine.

2. Referring to Claim 3, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the method of claim 1, Bary further disclosing where document or each of the multiple documents is a web document downloaded

from a website (refer to par 0098).

3. Referring to Claim 5, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the method of claim 1, Bary further discloses where the particular rule comprises: determining that the sub-strings do not reference content (par 0184);"

Art Unit: 2451

4. Referring to Claim 7, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the method of claim 1, Bary further discloses where the particular rule comprises: determining that the sub-strings contain characters consistent with a session identifier (refer to par 0204).

5. Referring to Claim 8, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the method of claim 1. Bary further disclosing downloading content from the particular URL when the particular URL is determined to not already have been crawled (refer to par 0187).

6. Referring to Claim 9, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the method of claim 1, Bary further discloses storing the set of URLs extracted from the at least one document, including embedded session identifiers, for use in later accessing the set of URLs extracted from the at least one document (refer to par 0187); storing information based on the clean set of URLs for use in later determining whether additional URLs have already been extracted (refer to par 0187);

7. Referring to Claim 10, Bary discloses a method comprising: receiving, by a communication interface or an input device of the computer system a set of uniform resource locator (refer to Fig 3); analyzing the set of URL for sub-strings that are structured in a manner consistent with session identifiers (refer to par 0187, par 0196);

Although Bary disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Bary did not explicitly disclosing "identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs;"

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing “identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs (refer to par 0090 and par 0091)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Bary and Galai because Galai’s teaching of “identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs;” improves Bary’s system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (refer to Hunt, par 203 and par 0235) and also provides the users’ of Bary a better website search engine.

8. Referring to Claim 11, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the method of 10, Bary further discloses where the set of URLs are extracted from a web document associated with a web host (refer to par 0072-0073).

9. Referring to Claims 12, Bary, Galai, and Moricz disclosed the method of claim 10, Bary further discloses wherein the set of URLs are extracted from multiple documents associated with a single web host (refer to par 0072-0073).

10. Referring to Claim 13, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the method of claim 10. Bary further disclosing removing identified session identifiers from the set of URLs; and storing the set of URLs with the removed session identifiers, as a clean set of URL (refer to par 0187).

11. Referring to Claim 15, Bary discloses a device comprising: a memory to store instruction (refer to par 0188); a processor to execute the instruction to implement (refer to par 0188);

at least one fetch bot configured to download content on network from locations specified by uniform resource locators/URLs (refer to par 0072-0073);

a content manager configured to extract URLs from the content (refer to par 0098), and identify sessions identifiers from URLs extracted from the content based (refer to par 0205); a URL manager create clean versions of the URLs extracted from the downloaded content by removing the session identifiers from the URLs and to store the clean versions of the URLs (refer to par 0187 and par 0196);

Although Bary disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Bary did not explicitly disclosing "identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs;"

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing "identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs (refer to par 0090 and par 0091)"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Bary and Galai because Galai's teaching of "identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs;" improves Bary's system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (refer to Hunt, par 203 and par 0235) and also provides the users' of Bary a better website search engine.

12. Referring to Claim 16, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the device of claim 15, Bary further discloses where the content manager is further to identify the session identifiers based on locating sub-strings, within the URLs extract from the content, that contain characters consistent with session identifiers (refer to par 0204).

13. Referring to Claim 17, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the device of claim 15, Bary further discloses a database to store the downloaded content (refer to par 0186).

14. Referring to Claim 18, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the device of claim 15. Bary further discloses wherein the URL manager is further configured to determine when additional URL have previously been stored by comparing clean version of the additional URLs to the stored clean versions of the URLs extracted from the content (refer to par 0186);

15. Referring to Claim 19, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the device of claim 15, Bary further disclosing the session identifiers include characters from the URLs extracted from the downloaded content that do not reference content (refer to 0196).

16. Referring to Claim 20, BARY discloses a device comprising: hardware – implemented means for receiving a set of uniform resource locator (refer to par 0072-0073); hardware – implemented means analyzing the set of URL for sub-strings that are structured in a manner consistent with session identifiers (refer to par 0187, par 0196); and hardware – implemented means further analyzing the set of URLs to identify of the sub-strings as corresponding to session identifier (refer to par 0196);

Although Bary disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Bary did not explicitly disclosing “identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs;”

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing “identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs (refer to par 0090 and par 0091)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Bary and Galai because Galai’s teaching of “identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs;” improves Bary’s system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (refer to Hunt, par 203 and par 0235) and also provides the users’ of Bary a better website search engine.

17. Referring to Claim 21, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the device of 20, Bary further discloses where the set of URLs are extracted from a web document associated with a web host (refer to par 0072-0073).

18. Referring to Claim 22, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the device of claim 20, Bary further discloses wherein the set of URLs are extracted from multiple documents associated with a single web host (refer to par 0072-0073).

19. Referring to Claim 23, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the device of claim 20. Bary further disclosing removing identified session identifiers from the set of URLs; and storing the set of URLs with the removed session identifiers, as a clean set of URL (refer to par 0186);

Art Unit: 2451

20. Referring to Claims 25, BARY discloses one or more memory device that include program instruction that when executed by at least one processor causes the at least one processor to perform a method including:

receiving a set of uniform resource locator (refer to par 0072-0073);

analyzing the set of URL for sub-strings that are structured in a manner consistent with session identifiers (refer to par 0187, par 0196); and

further analyzing the set of URLs to identify of the sub-strings as corresponding to session identifier (refer to par 0196);

Although Bary disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Bary did not explicitly disclosing “identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs;”

Galai, in analogous art, disclosing “identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs (refer to par 0090 and par 0091)”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Bary and Galai because Galai’s teaching of “identifying sub-string based on the sub-strings occurring in multiple URLs of the set of URLs;” improves Bary’s system environment in order for system to provide more consistent search "hit" to the users (refer to Hunt, par 203 and par 0235) and also provides the users’ of Bary a better website search engine.

21. Referring to Claim 26, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the computer-readable memory device, BARY further discloses where the set of URLs are extracted from a web document associated with a web host (refer to par 0072-0073).

22. Referring to Claim 27, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the computer-readable memory device of claim 25, Galai discloses wherein the set of URLs are extracted from multiple documents associated with a single web host (refer to par 0072-0073).

23. Referring to Claim 28, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed one or more memory device of claim 25. Bary further disclosing removing identified session identifiers from the set of URLs; and storing the set of URLs with the removed session identifiers, as a clean set of URL (refer to par 0186);

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bary et al hereinafter Bary (US 2004/0158429) in view of Galai (US 2004/0177015) in further view of Hunt et al hereinafter Hunt (US 2004/0133848) and in further view of Najork (US 6,952,730).

24. Referring to Claim 4, Bary, Galai, and Hunt disclosed the method of claim 1. Although Bary, Galai, and Hunt disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Bary, Galai, and Hunt did not explicitly disclosing “where the comparison of the particular URL and for each of the URLs in the clean set of URLs, and where the comparison is based on a comparison second URL to the clean set of URL is based on a comparison of a fingerprint value calculated for each of the URLs in the clean set of URLs.”

Najork, in an analogous art disclosed “where the comparison of the particular URL and for each of the URLs in the clean set of URLs, and where the comparison is based on a comparison

second URL to the clean set of URL is based on a comparison of a fingerprint value calculated for each of the URLs in the clean set of URLs (refer to Col 9, Lines 4-17).”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Bary, Galai, Hunt and Nojork because Nojork’s teaching of “where the comparison of the particular URL and for each of the URLs in the clean set of URLs, and where the comparison is based on a comparison second URL to the clean set of URL is based on a comparison of a fingerprint value calculated for each of the URLs in the clean set of URLs” improves Bary, Galai, and Hunt’s system environment by provide an efficient data structures that keep in tracks of downloaded document due to crawling the web pages.

Claims 14, 24, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bary et al hereinafter Bary (US 2004/0158429) in view of Galai (US 2004/0177015) in further view of Hunt et al hereinafter Hunt (US 2004/0133848) and in further view of Levergood et al hereinafter Levergood (US 2008/0201344)

25. Referring to Claim 14, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the method of claim 13. Although Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Bary, Galai and Hunt does not explicitly regarding “adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document.” Levergood, an analogous art discloses, “adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document. (refer to par 0016)’

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Bary, Galai and Hunt because Levergood's teaching of "adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document" improves Bary, Galai and Hunt's system environment in order for system to prevent unwanted intrusion to private local area networks system.

26. Referring to Claim 24, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the device of claim 23. Although Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Bary, Galai and Hunt does not explicitly regarding "adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document." Levergood, an analogous art discloses, "adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document. (refer to par 0016)"

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Bary, Galai and Hunt because Levergood's teaching of "adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document" improves Bary, Galai and Hunt's system environment in order for system to prevent unwanted intrusion to private local area networks system.

27. Referring to Claim 29, Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed one or more memory device of claim 28.

Although Bary, Galai and Hunt disclosed the invention substantially as claimed, Bary, Galai and Hunt does not explicitly regarding “adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document.”

Levergood, an analogous art discloses, “adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document. (refer to par 0016)’

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Bary, Galai and Hunt because Levergood’s teaching of “adding a generated session identifier to URLs in the clean set of URLs when the URL are to be used to access a web document” improves Bary, Galai and Hunt’s system environment in order for system to prevent unwanted intrusion to private local area networks system.

Conclusion

Examiner’s Notes: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karen C. Tang whose telephone number is (571)272-3116. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7 - 3.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Karen C Tang/

Examiner, Art Unit 2451

Application/Control Number: 10/743,547
Art Unit: 2451

Page 15